

would do so), and that successive generations would eventually become pure white, with little if any red tinge.\*

The geographical range of the two species suggests, from this standpoint, such a relationship between the two species, *E. ruber* being strictly tropical, and scarcely extending beyond the parallel of 20° north latitude, except as an accidental straggler, while *E. albus* is decidedly more northern, its centre of abundance lying between the parallels of 20° and 30° north.

The importance of this case as affecting the status of certain so-called dichromatic species of water-birds (notably among Herons) is very great. Probably no one would be willing to consider *Eudocimus ruber* and *E. albus* as dichromatic phases or races of one species; yet they are apparently as much so as *Ardea occidentalis* and *A. würdemanni* or *A. wardi* on the one hand or *Dichromanassa rufa* and *D. pealei* on the other; or at least, the probability of their common origin is evident.

A nearly parallel example is afforded by the Snow Goose (*Chen hyperboreus*) and Blue-winged Goose (*C. caerulescens*). In 'North American Water Birds,' Vol. I, page 437, the absolute similarity of size and proportions, involving all structural details, in these supposed species, notwithstanding the great difference of colors, is alluded to, as "a fact which suggests the mere possibility of their being white and colored phases of one species, as in some Herons," and that, the chief variations in *A. caerulescens* being a tendency to increased extent of the white markings, "the possibility of such a relationship should be borne in mind."

---

## ON THE OCCURRENCE OF THE WHITE-WINGED GULL (*LARUS LEUCOPTERUS* FABER) IN THE STATE OF NEW YORK.

BY GEORGE N. LAWRENCE.

EARLY in March of this year, I was requested by Mr. John G. Bell, to examine a Gull which had been sent to him to be

---

\*I am informed by persons who have shot *E. albus* in Florida that the plumage of living and freshly killed birds is decidedly tinged with pink or rose-color.

mounted, and as it was unknown to him, to determine the species.

On examination I found it to be a young specimen of *Larus leucopterus*; it was sent to him by Mrs. Greene Smith of Peterboro, N. Y., at which place it was captured.

I informed Dr. Merriam of the fact and suggested that he should write to Mrs. Smith, asking for particulars concerning it. He did so, and has communicated to me the following information:—

“Mrs. Greene Smith being away, the letter was answered by Mr. H. C. Wilson, her overseer. Wilson says: ‘The Gull spoken of by you was shot by a farmer’s boy, three-quarters of a mile from this place, in an open spring place,  $1\frac{1}{2}$  rods long by 10 or 12 feet wide, on the first day of February. The boy wounded it and kept it alive for two or three days. It was doubtless driven inland by the severe storm of about that date, as there is no open water nearer than Seneca Lake, 75 miles from this place.’ This completes the data on the bird, I believe.”

Mr. Bell said it was in poor condition; this was to be expected, from inability to procure its customary food.

The general plumage is of a dull white, marked all over with light ashy-brown spots; these are most distinct on the back and wings, and less defined on the head, neck, and under plumage; the quills are white on the inner webs, and ashy on the outer; there is no indication of any black spots on the ends of the primaries; the tail-feathers are light ashy-brown, mottled with dull white on the inner webs, except near their ends, where the ash color is immaculate; the bill is blackish-brown; the tarsi and toes are flesh-color.

The wing measures 16 inches; the tail, 6.50; the tarsus, 2; the bill from front, 1.50; from gape, 2.50; height at angle, 70.

This is the first immature specimen of this species I have had the opportunity to examine; it agrees very well with Audubon’s figure of the young; the difference in plumage from that of the adult is very similar in character to that which exists in *Larus glaucus*.

There are but few references to its appearance in our state. Audubon says of it: “I have not met with this species farther south than the Bay of New York.”

I inquired of Dr. Merriam for further information concerning it; he wrote as follows: “I have myself recorded *Larus leucopt-*

*terus* from the Adirondacks (Bull. N. O. C., Vol. VI, No. 4, Oct. 1880, p. 235). I did not kill the bird, but saw them (there were two) for several hours flying about a pond. They were smaller than *argentatus*, and the primaries were without black tips. This was just after the ice had gone out of the lakes in April, 1878."

---

## BIRD NOMENCLATURE OF THE CHIPPEWA INDIANS.

BY W. W. COOKE.

DURING a three years' residence among the Chippewas at White Earth, Minn., I had many opportunities of learning the names which they give to birds, and some of their ideas regarding them. These Indians claim to have a name for each and every kind of bird inhabiting their county; as a fact, they have no specific name for fully one-half of those which yearly nest before their eyes, or pass by in migration. We may say in general that they give names to all winter residents, since at that time bird life is so scarce that each one is accurately noticed, while summer birds of much greater dissimilarity receive but one name.

Among summer residents, nearly all those that are hunted for food are named and described. Indeed, few white hunters, or ornithologists, can recognize the different species of Ducks as quickly or at as great a distance as many of these Indians. Of the other summer birds, most of the large species have names, but some of these, as, for example, those of the Hawks and Owls, are very loosely applied. They all seem to be familiar with the names, but not with the particular bird to which each belongs. This may be accounted for by the large number of stories about these birds which are told to the children, teaching them the names, but not the appearance of the birds. The small birds of summer seem to the Indian beneath his notice, and when asked the name, the answer not uncommonly is, "Why do you want to know its name? It isn't good to eat." They consider that when to a small winged animal they have given the name 'bird,' they have done their whole duty.